

SR



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/689,750	10/13/2000	Ville Eerola	PM 274424 2000009US/K	6063

7590 08/02/2004

KIMBERLEY G. NOBLES
IRELL & MANELLA LLP
840 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 400
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, LAWRENCE B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2634

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/689,750

Applicant(s)

EEROLA ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence B Williams

Art Unit

2634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Best Available Copy

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
2. Figures 1-3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 4-35 and 4-41. Corrected drawing sheets, or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2634

4. Applicant uses dashed lines to enclose certain elements in Fig. 4 such as elements 4-8 and 4-10. Examiner suggests applicant number and explain the enclosures or delete from figure.

Specification

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:
- a.) Applicant uses form and legal phraseology throughout the abstract.
 - b.) Examiner suggests applicant delete the phrase "(Figure 4)".

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

6. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. **The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided.** The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
- a.) Examiner suggest applicant place a period after elements in line 1 of page 3.
 - b.) Examiner suggest applicant inset "an" between of and acquisition in line 36 of page 3.
 - c.) On page 4, lines 1-9, applicant states that the signal of the 3-Q branch is shifted by 90 degrees. From Fig. 3, it appears that the 3-I signal is also shifted 90 degrees by the phase inverter 3-4. Examiner suggests applicant clarify this paragraph.
 - d.) Page 10, line 11 cites two shift registers 4-22, while Fig. 4 shows only one shift register 4-22.

Best Available Copy

Appropriate correction is required.

8. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

9. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the coherent integrator" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
10. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the coherent integrator" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
11. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the coherent integrator" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
12. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer together claims in the alternative only and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Best Available Copy

Art Unit: 2634

14. Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Janc et al. (US Patent 4, 785,463).

(1) With regard to claim 1, Janc et al. discloses in Figs. 1-3, a device for detecting a demodulated signal received by a spread spectrum receiver and converted into digital samples, the device comprising: a matched filter (322, 324) for calculating the correlation between an incoming signal and at least one reference signal; an oscillator (108) for generating a sampling frequency; a sampling circuit (310) for re-sampling said demodulated digital sample at said sampling frequency, which is such that the timing of samples of a sample signal going from the sampling circuit to the matched filter corresponds to the timing of the reference signals of the matched filter; and a multiplier (332, 334) in which the sample signal is multiplied by a carrier replica generated locally before the sampling circuit or thereafter, to remove the carrier from the sample signal (col. 24, line 23- col. 25, line 52).

(2) With regard to claim 12, Janc et al. also discloses wherein the device is multi-channel and searches time-dividely in parallel for two or more received signals (col. 3, lines 55-65).

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claims 2-8, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Best Available Copy

Conclusion


16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence B Williams whose telephone number is 703-305-6969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 703-305-4714. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lawrence B. Williams

lbw
July 19, 2004


STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Best Available Copy